754 761 [626] after, Jane Simms' sister, who had been standing beside her at the funeral, died. The Porters were driven out of Fort Bidwell.

Arriving in Burns, the family was already under suspicion and it would have been very strange if they had not been accused sooner or later of using their sorcery power again. Several informants explained to me that they knew it would happen [753] because the Porters would get sick if they did not use their power. It was said that they both had been sick at different times because their power had told them to kill and they had not obeyed.

754 684 761 The first incident which was interpreted in terms of their power was the death of a Chinese man in the town of Burns. It was known that he made sexual advances to Mrs. Porter's daughter. One day Mrs. Porter caught him putting his hands on her daughter's breast. She evidently scolded him and threatened him. I imagine she felt safe in doing this as the Indian community would hardly blame her and no one would be motivated to retaliate. When he died some months later, all agreed that she had sent her power after him. The story was told that she had hit him with a pebble which contained her power. It was also stated that the Chinaman had swollen up before he died just as if he had bitten by a snake.

764 761 The death of Mr. M. has already been discussed; after it the Porters were accused and forced to leave Burns. It was also seen that Mr. M. was Mrs. Porter's own cousin and that she had been very fond of him. The circumstances preceding his death pointed to the fact that she had been angry with him because he would not take her to Drewsey when he went camping. There is also evidence that Mrs. M., perhaps out of jealousy and perhaps to protect herself, or for both reasons, saw to it that Mrs. Porter was accused. As a result of this incident the Porters were taken to Warm Springs.

They had been in Warm Springs about two years when this field work was done. I asked if they had used their power up there and several informants stated that they thought they had been better and were getting over their power.

[155 208] In summary, Mrs. Porter's reputation seemed to grow in a snowball fashion. It started with the community's expectation that she would be mean like her parents. Undoubtedly her personality was formed both by her parents and by the community's reaction to her as the child of mean parents. The treatment she received probably made her over-aggressive. It obviously made her a good scapegoat. The suspicions and gossip about her were stamped by public approval after the Porter-Simms case, and the fact that the Porters left Fort Bidwell was interpreted as a confession of guilt. As a result they were open to any accusation of sorcery and had no protection against retaliation. When Mrs. Porter was accused of killing Mr. M., although the evidence was very flimsy, some people even saying that she was not guilty, she did not dare face the storm and she and her family left Burns.

754 Next to the Porters the T.'s were considered the most dangerous couple. In the

7: Whiting E-5 (1936-1938) 1950
NR13 Northern Paiute NR13

quieted the men and stopped the fight. When Helen fought Anne, the people stood around and watched until they thought things had gone far enough. Then they hauled Helen off Anne. In this way the community, often led by a relative of one of the fighters, steps in to keep retaliation from going too far. The crowd standing around and watching a fight, therefore, functions in a sense as a judiciary body. When they agree among themselves that the retaliation has gone far enough, they stop the fight. Very often the relative who steps in, backed by the crowd, is a brother or cousin of the person who is getting the best of the fight, rather than a relative of the person getting beaten. It is to his advantage to check the violence, as he and his relatives will be held responsible if the retaliation goes too far.

Payment of the wergild before it is demanded often prevents retaliatory feuds from starting. The family of the woman who shot her rival felt it safest to pay blood money in spite of the fact that there was some justification for the crime. This was also seen to be the case in the murders which resulted from fights over nonfulfillment of obligations.

The second type of fear which functions as a method of social control, the fear of being accused of sorcery, serves as a more indirect method of controlling retaliation. Indication of the general way in which the fear of being accused of sorcery works in social control has been given in previous chapters; it also operates as a check to retaliation as indicated by the following evidence. Informants stated that if a man was a good person with good thoughts, he would do nothing if his wife went off with another man. Only people with bad thoughts, according to this report, fight their rivals. One informant said in this connection that he was most surprised that Tom T., mean as he was, did not go after the man that stole his first wife. Concerning theft it was stated that only people with bad thoughts took revenge by entering the house of the suspect and destroying some of his property. Informants stated that ideally a person should ask the suspect on two different occasions whether he had stolen the property and if he denied it both times, no further action should be taken. Dick Jonas praised Maggie Jonas for not taking action against the people she suspected of stealing her money and said that it was because she was good. On the other hand, informants stated that if a person avenged himself against a thief by entering his house and destroying some of his property, the thief should not retaliate. Concerning killing a person's horse without permission it was stated that only a mean man would refuse to pay damages when accused. It was said that to hold a loser too closely to his debt in any gambling game is mean and that a good person would suggest that a loser who did not want to give up what he had actually bet pay in some other way. It has also been seen that what is considered unprovoked retaliation is taken as evidence of sorcery power.

There is then a conflict between the stated ideals of what one should do when wronged and the theory of an eye for an eye retaliation. The group who passes judgment on whether retaliation is within reason (and the best course of action)

[626] are not merely the relatives of the disputants but the entire community. They serve
[627] as an informal judiciary. They listen to the gossip, help pass along all the facts
[183] they hear, and again through the channel of gossip let it be known what they think of the merits of the case. Inasmuch as public opinion is very important and a man cannot afford to be considered mean, the relatives of the disputants keep their ears close to the ground and exert their strong family influence over the individual involved in the fight. An example of this is seen in the case of Maggie Jonas.
[685] When she lost her money she suspected a certain person. She went and told her cousin, Dick Jonas, the name of the person she suspected. According to custom she could have accused this person directly and, if he refused to return the money, she could have destroyed some of his property. Dick Jonas talked the matter over with Maggie and with Helen, his daughter, and his son-in-law. They decided that Maggie really did not have enough evidence and that she had better not accuse the person. However, by this time, the gossip had gone the rounds of the entire camp, and the person accused undoubtedly felt nervous whether he had committed the
[681] offense or not. In a sense Maggie had retaliated by casting suspicion on him, but she was restrained from further action by the fact that her relatives did not want to support the case. Had her family and the community backed her more strongly and added evidence and support through the channel of gossip, Maggie might have taken a stronger stand. On the other hand, had she gone beyond their decision of what was just, she would have been criticized and considered "mean."

[754] The fear of being accused of sorcery, besides checking retaliation, functions as a deterrent to any anti-social behavior. As was seen in the chapter on the sorcerer, even minor anti-social behavior such as appearing angry or not speaking pleasantly to people is sanctioned by this fear. Here again the community functions as a
[208] judiciary body, collecting its evidence and circulating its opinions through the channel of gossip. The doctor also has a judiciary role. His decision that a person
[756] is a sorcerer and his statements to this effect, as handed down in the diagnosis of disease, give legal validity to the accusations.

[754] The fear of sorcery itself is the third type of fear which functions in social control. A sorcerer may retaliate by using his power instead of retaliating physically or demanding payment. For example, Mrs. Porter is said to have punished Sophie for stealing her beads by killing her mother by sorcery. Another woman with bad power made Sophie sick because she stole her husband. The Porters killed Polly because they felt her sister was responsible for the death of their son. Mrs. Porter killed a Chinaman for making advances to her daughter. Tom T. used his power twice to punish people who were too aggressive in playing games. But beyond these specific fears of people who are known to have power there is the fear that there are people who may have power. They may be the very individuals a person harms when he commits an offense, or they may be relatives of these individuals.
[776] Furthermore, it is believed that people with power can find out by virtue of their

A CROSS-CULTURAL STUDY OF SORCERY AND SOCIAL CONTROL[1]

626 593 627 681 IT has been shown that social control in Paiute society is administered by the extended family. Retaliation is the essential mechanism for maintaining law and order and takes the form of direct physical violence or sorcery. When a person wrongs another, he fears not only assault but sickness. On the other hand, the practice of sorcery is a crime and leads to retaliation, so that a person is afraid of being accused of sorcery. The only check on retaliation is public opinion; the by-
● [208] standers witnessing a fight may separate the contestants and advise them to make up their differences, and gossip, particularly accusations of meanness, checks excessive violence.

121 626 A survey of a selected sample of primitive tribes throughout the world suggests that there are two main types of social control: the coordinate and the superordinate. Paiute society is an example of the first type, the essential characteristics of which are the absence of an individual or group of individuals with delegated authority to settle disputes and punish offenses and the presence of retaliation administered by peers as the major mechanism for social control. The kin or local group avenges wrongs done to its members and defends them from retaliation by outsiders. In societies which have superordinate control, on the other hand, the persons who decide disputes and punish wrongs are not necessarily members of the injured man's or criminal's group but are selected by birth, talent, or popular election. Because of their authority they have higher status than the disputants in the case.

[154] The fact that both sorcery and coordinate control are found in Paiute society, and, as careful analysis has shown, are functionally related, suggested that they should occur together in other societies. The purpose of this chapter is to present a preliminary cross-cultural test of this hypothesis.

121 If the hypothesis is true, it should be possible to derive it from accepted anthropological and psychological principles. The analysis of sorcery and social control in Paiute society suggest that the following principles are operating. Since, by definition, coordinate control is based upon retaliation, it follows that whenever a person wrongs another he is punished by the wronged person or by the wronged

[1] This cross-cultural study was made in 1941-42 when the files were less complete than they are today and when the techniques of cross-cultural study were in their infancy. This study can only be considered exploratory. Lack of access to the files has made it impossible to check and expand the study.